Table ES-2. Environmental Ranking of California CREZs.			
CREZ Name	Annual Energy (GWh/yr)	Cumulative Energy (GWh/yr)	Environmental Ranking Score
Imperial North-A	10,095	10,095	<u>2.7</u>
Twentynine Palms	<u>1,944</u>	<u>12,038</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Mountain Pass	<u>,6,942</u>	<u> 18,980</u>	<u>3.9</u>
Tehachapi	25,091	<u>44,072</u>	4 <u>,0</u>
Fairmont	<u>18,318</u>	<u>62,390</u>	4 <u>,0</u>
Pisgah-A	<u>4,283</u>	<u>,66,673</u>	<u>4.4</u>
San Diego South	<u>1,829</u>	<u>,68,502</u>	<u>4.4</u>
<u>Imperial East</u>	<u>3,991</u>	<u>72,493</u>	4 <u>.9</u>
San Bernardino - Lucerne	<u>10,722</u>	<u>83,215</u>	<u>4.9</u>
Victorville-A	2 <u>,112</u>	<u>85,327</u>	5 <u>.0</u>
<u>Iron Mountain</u>	12,713	<u>98,040</u>	<u>5.0</u>

CREZs identified above are those in which EWG data and ranking methodology indicate that energy development may create fewer environmental concerns. Ranking scores are not intended to represent the level of concern in any individual project which may occur within a CREZ. The EWG CREZ ranking process is not intended in any way to prejudge or substitute for a thorough environmental review of proposed projects as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Instead, incorporating environmental factors into CREZ ranking is intended to anticipate potential concerns associated with energy development and the transmission facilities needed to access these areas, thereby facilitating approval. CREZs able to be developed at the least economic cost and least environmental concern present the strongest case for approval of new transmission facilities.

Combined Assessment of CREZs

The economic and environmental CREZ ranking processes are based on two different concerns; the former attempts to minimize economic costs, while the latter attempts to minimize environmental concerns. Since the assessments are based on different metrics, it is impossible to develop a single formula for combining the two sets of results.

Nevertheless, the Stakeholder Steering Committee is faced with the task of recommending new major transmission facilities needed to access needed renewable

٨	,
1	Deleted: 28,412
$\left\{ \right.$	Deleted: 4.
1	Deleted: Twentynine Palms
1	Deleted: 1,944
1	Deleted: 30,356
1	Deleted: 4.
1	Deleted: 55,447
1	Deleted: 3
1	Deleted: Pisgah-A
1	Deleted: 4,283
ĺ	Deleted: 59,731
ĺ	Deleted: 8
Ì	Deleted: Victorville
)	Deleted: 2,112
Ì	Deleted: 68,785
ĺ	Deleted: 5.3
ĺ	Deleted: Mountain Pass
ĺ	Deleted: 6,942
	Deleted: 66,673
اُ	Deleted: 5.3
	Deleted: San Bernardino - Lucerne
	Deleted: 10,722
	Deleted: 79,506
	Deleted: 5.
	Deleted: Kramer
	Deleted: 16,251
	Deleted: 95,758
	Deleted: 5.7
	Deleted: Palm Springs
	Formatted Table
ľ	Deleted: 465
j	Deleted: 98,223
1	Deleted: 9
	Deleted: Note: The Lassen CREZs have been reconfigured recently and the revised environmental ranking scores for these areas are not yet available. When the analysis is complete, a revised version of the draft final report will be posted on

the RETI web site

Deleted: 3.1
Deleted: Fairmont
Deleted: 18,318